A Systematic Analysis of Moral Objectivity: Definition, Criteria, and Foundational Metaethical Debates

I. Introduction to Metaethical Foundations

1.1. Defining Objective Morality (Moral Objectivism/Realism)

Objective morality, fundamentally a position within metaethics, is systematically known as **Moral Objectivism** or **Moral Realism**. This perspective asserts that moral claims possess truth values—they are either true or false—and that these values exist entirely independently of human cognition, feelings, or cultural preferences.[1]

The essence of objective morality lies in the proposition that certain acts are inherently good or bad, meaning their moral status holds true regardless of the evaluating agent or the beliefs prevalent in their society.[1] This contrasts sharply with subjective or relativistic views. For instance, the widely recognized principle that intentionally taking the life of an innocent person is morally wrong serves as a typical example of an objective principle, as its wrongness is deemed universal and not contingent upon personal preference or cultural interpretation.[2]

The Criterion of Stance-Independence

The defining feature of objective morality is **stance-independence** (or mind-independence). A moral fact is considered objective if its existence and veracity do not depend on what any individual or group thinks about it.[3] This ontological requirement posits that objective moral truths are part of the "fabric of the world" [5], existing externally, much like amoral facts in science or mathematics.[2] For a moral system to be objective, it must demonstrate that its moral standards are grounded in an external, unchanging framework, ensuring they are not subject to personal whims or societal changes.[2]

Semantic and Metaphysical Claims

Objective morality combines three claims regarding moral reality: a semantic claim, an alethic claim, and a metaphysical claim.[6] The semantic claim holds that moral claims are truth-apt (capable of being true or false). The alethic claim asserts that *some* moral claims are definitively true. Crucially, the metaphysical claim demands that these moral facts are objective, existing independently of subjective states about their truth value.[6] This confluence establishes that moral objectivity is intrinsically reliant on the actual, external existence of moral properties. Any challenge that successfully denies the stance-independent existence of these facts simultaneously negates the possibility of objective moral truth, rendering moral

statements either universally false or merely expressive.

1.2. The Anti-Realist Context: Defining by Opposition

A precise understanding of objective morality necessitates comparing it with the predominant anti-realist competitors, particularly those that characterize morality as contingent or mind-dependent.

- **Moral Subjectivism:** This view grants that moral statements can be true or false, but their truth value is dependent upon the individual subject's beliefs, feelings, or preferences.[6] Moral properties are subjective, akin to matters of taste.[3] Objective morality refutes this, insisting that an action's moral valence is external to the observer.
- **Moral Relativism:** This thesis posits that moral judgments are true or false only relative to a specific viewpoint, such as that of a particular culture, historical period, or societal code.[6] While relativism accepts that moral truth can depend on facts about the world (e.g., laws of a country), it denies that any single framework is privileged, thus rejecting a universal moral standard.[7] Objective morality, conversely, maintains that fundamental moral principles apply universally.[2]
- **Non-Cognitivism and Moral Nihilism (Error Theory):** These represent distinct, stronger forms of anti-realism:
    - **Non-Cognitivism** (e.g., Emotivism) rejects the semantic claim, asserting that moral statements do not make claims about reality; instead, they are merely expressions of subjective feelings or emotional attitudes (e.g., saying "Torture is immoral" is like wincing or saying "ugh").[10]
    - **Moral Nihilism** (often associated with **Error Theory**) agrees with objectivism that moral judgments purport to describe objective moral facts, but maintains that because no such facts exist in the world, all positive moral claims are systematically false.[12] For the nihilist, the very concept of right and wrong is a mistake.[12] Objective morality stands directly opposed, asserting that moral facts not only exist but are what ground the truth-aptness of moral judgments.

The relationship between these competing frameworks is summarized below:

Table I: Metaethical Frameworks and the Status of Moral Truth

Theory	Status of Moral Claims (Semantic)	Existence of Moral Facts (Metaphysical)	Source of Moral Truth (Grounding)	Key Feature/Stance
Moral Objectivism/R	Truth-apt	Yes, Mind-Indepen	External (God, Reason,	Moral facts are part of the

ealism	(True or False)	dent/Objective	Nature)	"fabric of the world" [5]
Moral Subjectivism	Truth-apt (True or False)	Yes, Subjective/Mind-Dependent	Individual belief, feeling, or preference [3]	Morality is akin to matters of taste
Moral Relativism	Truth-apt (True or False)	Yes, Relative/Stance-Dependent	Cultural or societal framework [7]	Truth is only true relative to a framework [6]
Moral Nihilism/Error Theory	Truth-apt (False) or Not Truth-apt	No, Moral properties do not exist	N/A (Systematic error in judgment) [13]	All moral statements are systematically false or meaningless

II. The Constitutive Criteria of Objective Morality

For any system of ethics to qualify as objectively moral, it must satisfy specific, rigorous criteria across the domains of metaphysics, semantics, and epistemology. These criteria collectively establish the non-contingent and universal nature of moral truth.

2.1. Metaphysical Criteria: The Nature of Moral Reality

These criteria address the ontological status of moral properties, defining what they must be in the world.

Stance-Independence

Stance-independence is the most critical metaphysical requirement. An objective moral property must exist and retain its moral valence regardless of human recognition, belief, or attitude toward it.[1] The moral quality of an action is therefore fixed and external to human subjectivity, analogous to how the shape of an object remains fixed even if observers mistakenly believe it to be different.[3] This rigorous requirement distinguishes philosophical moral objectivism from simpler, widely held moral beliefs that merely demand universality or societal agreement.

Moral Realism and Universal Principles

Objective morality relies on **Moral Realism**, the commitment to the existence of objective moral properties or facts as genuine features of the world.[4] These facts are typically understood to ground **Universal Moral Principles**.[2] Such principles must apply

unconditionally to all rational agents, across all cultures, societies, and time periods.[15] Proponents often argue that this universality is rooted in a common human nature, driven by shared characteristics like empathy and a fundamental desire for justice, which form the basis for moral standards transcending cultural boundaries.[15]

Intrinsic Prescriptivity

A unique feature distinguishing objective moral facts from objective natural facts (like gravitational constants) is the requirement for **intrinsic prescriptivity**. If an objective moral property exists, it must possess inherent action-guiding force; it must provide reasons for action independent of an individual's existing desires or aversions.[17] Understanding an objective moral fact should intrinsically motivate a rational agent to act accordingly. This metaphysical expectation places a tremendous burden on objective theories, as anti-realists frequently point to this requirement—that the universe must contain inherent "to-be-doneness" or "not-to-be-doneness"—as the basis for claiming objective values are metaphysically "queer" or strange.[19]

2.2. Semantic Criteria: The Form of Moral Language

These criteria ensure that moral discourse within an objective framework is meaningful and non-arbitrary.

Truth-Aptness (Cognitivism)

Objective morality must adhere to **Cognitivism**, the semantic view that moral claims are truth-apt propositions capable of being evaluated as either true or false.[4] This excludes metaethical positions, such as non-cognitivism, which interpret moral utterances solely as emotional expressions or commands rather than claims about reality.[10]

Non-Arbitrariness

The moral standards must be **non-arbitrary**, meaning they cannot be based on chance, caprice, or whim.[20] If the foundational source of morality—be it divine, rational, or natural—was arbitrary or contingent, then the resulting moral duties would lack ultimate authority and necessity. Establishing non-arbitrariness is central to defending objectivism, especially against challenges like the Euthyphro Dilemma, which question the ultimate justification of the moral standard itself.

2.3. Epistemological Criteria: How Moral Truth is Known

For objective moral truths to be practically relevant, they must be accessible and knowable by moral agents.

Attainable Moral Knowledge

Objective morality requires that it is possible for human beings to achieve genuine **moral**

knowledge—that is, warranted true belief about moral facts—and to identify when moral mistakes or errors have been made.[21] This capacity is essential, as the mere existence of moral facts without the ability to grasp them renders them normatively moot.

Non-Inferential Foundation

Many robust forms of moral objectivism rely on a foundationalist epistemology, where some fundamental moral truths are known **non-inferentially**.[22] Because objective moral truths cannot rely on contingent, empirical observations (which might vary culturally or individually), they are typically posited to be accessed through *a priori* means. This access is often characterized as **Rational Intuition** or a rational grasp of self-evident principles, operating independently of sense experience.[23] Philosophers like Kant, who argued that moral law is a truth of reason, and W. D. Ross, who defended ethical intuitionism, rely on this foundational structure to secure non-contingent and universal moral knowledge.[23]

The reliance on these non-inferential, *a priori* methods to secure mind-independence makes objective morality particularly susceptible to scrutiny. The existence of a specialized faculty capable of reliably detecting non-natural moral facts is precisely what anti-realists exploit in epistemological critiques, arguing that such a faculty is "queer" and implausible within a naturalistic worldview.[19] The debate therefore frequently hinges not on whether moral facts *are* objective, but on whether the cognitive mechanism required to *know* them reliably tracks objective reality.

Table II: Formal Criteria for Objective Moral Status

Criterion Domain	Criterion Name	Description and Requirement for Objectivity	Supporting Snippet Reference
Metaphysical	Stance-Independence	The truth value of a moral claim must not depend on anyone's subjective reaction, belief, or attitude toward it.	[1]
Metaphysical	Moral Realism (Ontology)	The actual existence of objective moral properties or facts in the world, similar	[2]

		to non-moral facts.	
Ontological	Universality	Moral principles must apply unconditionally to all moral agents, regardless of cultural, personal, or temporal variations.	[2]
Semantic	Truth-Aptness (Cognitivism)	Moral claims must be propositions capable of being true or false.	[4]
Epistemological	Non-Inferential Access	Moral knowledge must be attainable, often relying on *a priori* reason or intuition independent of empirical observation.	[22]

III. Foundational Theories: Grounding Objective Moral Truths

To satisfy the criteria of non-arbitrariness and stance-independence, objective morality must be grounded in an authoritative source. Historically, three main theories attempt to provide this foundational support.

3.1. Moral Rationalism (Kantian Deontology)

Immanuel Kant's ethical system establishes objective morality through **pure practical reason**. Kant argued that the supreme moral principle is the **Categorical Imperative (CI)**, which is an objective, unconditional requirement binding upon every rational being.[26]

The fundamental moral worth of an action is derived not from the outcome or purpose, but from the principle of volition (maxim) upon which the action is decided, judged by its potential to be willed as a universal law.[27] For Kant, morality is inextricably linked to rationality; all

specific moral requirements are justified by the CI, meaning that immoral actions are inherently irrational.[26]

This grounding is non-instrumental; moral requirements are not means to satisfying desires (as in Hobbesian thought) but are necessary standards essential to rational agency itself.[26] Because the moral law is necessary and universal, its grounding must have absolute worth, which Kant locates in the rational being itself existing as an "end in itself".[28] The access to this moral law is *a priori*—known through reason alone, reinforcing its objective and mind-independent status.[23]

3.2. Natural Law Theory (Teleological Realism)

Natural Law moral theory roots objectivity in the intrinsic nature of human beings and the world, often utilizing Aristotelian **teleology**.

Teleology and Human Flourishing

The theory posits that moral standards are objectively derived from understanding the inherent nature of humanity and the world.[30] Every entity has a *telos*—an end goal—and morally right actions are those that move the agent toward this good end.[31] The Classical Natural Law theory of Thomas Aquinas focuses on identifying **basic human goods**—fundamental intrinsic values (e.g., life, knowledge, justice, community) that constitute **human flourishing** (eudaimonia).[31]

Modern versions, such as those advanced by Martha Nussbaum, argue that certain values necessary for human flourishing (like compassion and justice) are universal and challenge cultural relativism by asserting these objective standards apply to all cultures, regardless of local practices.[16]

Moral Naturalism and Categorical Duty

Natural Law often falls under **Moral Naturalism**, the view that moral properties are identical with, or reducible to, certain natural properties (e.g., maximizing human well-being or flourishing).[14] A significant challenge arises here, however, concerning the categorical nature of moral requirements. If morality is equated only with natural flourishing, it can struggle to account for the intrinsically binding, "must-do" quality of objective moral duty. Critics of this approach, such as J. L. Mackie, argue that while natural properties describe what *is*, they cannot explain the categorical *ought*—a deficiency that often pushes objective theories toward non-naturalism to defend duty's binding force.[34]

3.3. Theological Realism (Divine Command Theory)

Theological Realism grounds objective morality in a transcendent, necessary being. This approach, historically the most common argument for moral objectivity, links moral laws to the

will and commands of God.[1]

The Modified Divine Command Theory

To counter criticisms of arbitrariness and external constraint, sophisticated Theological Realism employs the **Modified Divine Command Theory**.[36] This view asserts that morality is not based on God's arbitrary fiat but is intrinsically grounded in the eternal, immutable, and perfect **nature of God** itself.[20] God is not subject to an external moral law, but rather *is* that moral law; His essential properties are identical with His essence, which includes supreme goodness and justice.[38]

By defining God's nature as the source of truth and goodness, this theory maintains God's ultimate moral and metaphysical status while establishing a non-arbitrary, universal standard that applies to all human agents, thereby satisfying the criteria of stance-independence and non-arbitrariness.[36]

IV. Critical Challenges and Nuanced Realist Responses

The integrity of objective morality is tested by powerful anti-realist critiques, primarily concerning the universality of moral claims and the epistemology required to access moral facts.

4.1. Challenge from Moral Disagreement and Relativity

The argument from moral disagreement, sometimes called the Argument from Relativity, contends that the widespread, persistent, and intractable variation in moral views across cultures and historical periods undermines the plausibility of objective moral facts.[7] If an objective moral reality existed, disagreements should theoretically diminish over time as knowledge accrues, similar to progress in the sciences.[41] The existence of radically different moral codes suggests that moral judgments merely reflect local societal norms or "adherence to and participation in different ways of life".[40]

The Realist Reply: Moral Progress

A central response to moral relativism is the **Argument from Moral Progress**.[21] This argument asserts that many widely accepted social changes—such as the abolition of slavery, the expansion of human rights, or the granting of women's suffrage—are consistently viewed as genuine improvements over previous eras.[8] Such a judgment of "improvement" is only coherent if there exists an objective, non-relative moral standard toward which humanity is advancing.[43] If morality were merely relative, then abolitionists or suffragettes would have been acting wrongly according to their prevailing societal standards, and no true moral superiority could be claimed by the reforming culture.[8] The fact that individuals believe in the possibility of making moral progress suggests an underlying commitment to objectivity.[21]

The Realist Reply: Shallow Disagreement

Furthermore, realists often argue that much observed disagreement is superficial, occurring at the level of *secondary* moral rules or applications, driven by differences in non-moral factual beliefs, circumstances, or resource constraints.[40] Beneath these surface variations, proponents of objectivism suggest, lies a deeper agreement on fundamental moral principles, such as prohibitions against unjustified killing and the recognition of basic rights and justice.[15]

4.2. J. L. Mackie's Argument from Queerness

J. L. Mackie's Error Theory provides a two-pronged metaphysical and epistemological attack on objective morality, particularly targeting non-naturalist realism.

Metaphysical and Epistemic Queerness

Mackie argues that if objective moral properties existed, they would be metaphysically "queer" or unlike anything else in the universe.[41] This metaphysical strangeness stems from the requirement of **intrinsic prescriptivity**—that objective moral facts must contain inherent "reasons for action" independent of human motivation.[18]

Secondly, the properties are **epistemically queer**.[19] If we are to gain knowledge of these strange, non-natural moral entities, we must possess a corresponding, equally mysterious epistemic faculty, such as a specialized moral intuition, entirely distinct from ordinary sensory or scientific perception.[19] Mackie contends that the best explanation for the strangeness of these facts and the "spooky" epistemology required is simply that objective moral facts do not exist.[41]

The Realist Counter: Partners in Crime

A common realist strategy is the **Partners in Crime** or **Companions in Guilt** objection.[17] Realists argue that if objective moral facts are queer, then so too are facts in other non-empirical, normative domains, such as epistemology or logic.[17] For instance, the fact that evidence *P* supports conclusion *Q* gives an agent an **epistemic reason** to believe *Q*—a normative fact that seems to possess action-guiding force and yet is irreducible to natural properties. If one accepts the objective, irreducible normative facts in these other domains, the "queerness" of moral facts alone ceases to be a decisive reason for rejection.[41]

The Realist Counter: Moorean Shift

Another prominent response involves the **Moorean Shift**. This strategy accepts the structure of Mackie’s argument but flips the conclusion: the truth of certain, seemingly undeniable moral propositions (e.g., "Torturing a baby for pleasure is morally wrong") is held to be more certain than the anti-realist's premise that moral properties are objectionably queer.[13] The result is the conclusion that objective moral facts exist and are therefore *not* objectionably

queer.[13]

4.3. The Evolutionary Debunking Argument (EDA)

The EDA, significantly advanced by Sharon Street, launches an empirical and epistemological challenge against moral realism, particularly those forms that posit objective moral truths independent of human psychological evolution.

The Darwinian Dilemma and Epistemic Coincidence

The argument begins with the premise that human systems of moral judgment are thoroughly influenced by natural selection, which favored traits promoting survival and reproductive fitness among early humans.[46] The dilemma then arises for the moral realist: to explain the connection between these evolutionarily shaped evaluative attitudes and the existence of stance-independent moral truths.[46]

If objective moral truths exist independently, and evolution merely selected for beliefs useful for survival (regardless of whether those beliefs were morally true), then the convergence of our evolved moral beliefs with the actual objective moral truths would be a **massive coincidence**.[47] The argument concludes that this coincidence is too improbable; hence, if moral realism is true, we cannot have warranted moral beliefs or moral knowledge, leading to moral skepticism.[47]

The Realist Reply: The Third Factor Strategy

Moral realists counter the EDA primarily through the **Third Factor Reply**.[48] This response introduces a non-contingent factor—usually **Rationality**—that serves as the objective link between evolutionary pressures and moral truths, thereby defeating the coincidence problem.

Proponents of this strategy, like Peter Singer, argue that while evolution may have provided the foundational, kin-selective impulses for rudimentary altruism, the full development of human rational capacity transcends mere survival utility.[49] Rationality, in this view, is the independent, reliable, truth-tracking mechanism (the "Third Factor") that allows agents to grasp genuinely universal, objective moral principles, such as those embedded in Kantian *a priori* reasoning or the requirements of human flourishing.[48] The moral truths obtained through rational reflection, such as the inherent wrongness of intentional cruelty, often extend far beyond the narrow, survival-driven norms favored by crude evolutionary impulses, indicating that rationality itself is the path to objectivity.[49]

4.4. The Euthyphro Dilemma (Critique of Theological Grounding)

The Euthyphro Dilemma, derived from Plato’s dialogue, challenges the legitimacy of grounding objective morality in God’s will.

The Horns of Justification

The dilemma presents two exhaustive options for the relationship between God and goodness [20]:

1. **The Command Horn (Voluntarism):** Is an action moral *because* God commands it? If so, God's commands are arbitrary (based on whimsy), which undermines His rationality and suggests that anything, even cruelty, could become good upon command.[20]
2. **The Independence Horn (External Constraint):** Does God command an action *because* it is already moral? If so, an independent moral standard exists external to God, limiting His sovereignty and omnipotence, and suggesting that morality retains its authority even if God did not exist.[20]

The implication of this foundational critique is profound: any system of ethics must demonstrate that its core principle is necessarily good and independently legitimate while remaining the ultimate source of moral duties.

The Theological Realist Resolution

The predominant theological realist rebuttal asserts that the dilemma is false, typically by invoking the necessary identity between God's essence and His perfection.[50] Morality is not grounded in God's *commands* (His will) nor in an external Platonic Form, but in God's **immutable and perfect nature**.[20] God's essence is necessarily good, non-composite, and identical with all His perfections.[38] Therefore, God acts in accordance with His own necessary, perfectly rational nature, which *is* the standard of value. This resolution attempts to satisfy the demands of both horns: morality is ultimately grounded in God, preserving His sovereignty, while simultaneously being non-arbitrary because God's nature is necessarily good, not contingently willed.[20]

V. Conclusion: Synthesis and Implications

5.1. Synthesis of Definitional Requirements

Objective morality, or Moral Realism, is a rigorous metaethical position defined by its commitment to **stance-independent moral facts** that are **truth-apt** and **universally applicable** across all moral agents. Successful objective frameworks must adhere to strict metaphysical requirements, including the unique burden of accounting for **intrinsic prescriptivity**, and rely on robust epistemological foundations, typically involving *a priori* rational access or intuition, to gain knowledge of non-contingent truths.

The analysis of grounding theories reveals three primary strategies for establishing this objective foundation: the necessary dictates of **Pure Practical Reason** (Kantian Rationalism); the inherent **Teleology of Human Nature** aimed at flourishing (Natural Law); and the essential, non-contingent perfection of a **Divine Nature** (Theological Realism).

5.2. Implications for Contemporary Ethical Inquiry

The viability of objective morality carries critical implications for all domains of normative and applied ethics.

Justification of Moral Standards

Objective morality provides the necessary authority to justify universally binding moral requirements, asserting that certain actions are mandatory regardless of desires or social conventions.[26] This grounding is essential for establishing systems like Kantian deontology and Natural Law as dictates of what *must* be done, rather than just what is conventionally preferred.

Coherence of Moral Progress and Critique

The concept of objective morality is necessary to lend coherence to the notion of genuine moral progress and legitimate cross-cultural critique.[21] If moral standards were merely relative, societies could not legitimately judge past practices (e.g., institutionalized cruelty or slavery) or external cultures as being factually morally mistaken.[7] The consensus that changes like the abolition of slavery constitute progress logically presupposes an ultimate, non-relative moral standard toward which humanity can strive.[42]

The Future Focus of Moral Realism

The central challenge facing modern Moral Realism is epistemological, demanding a clear explanation of *how* we access objective truths without resorting to arbitrary assumptions. The most potent critiques (Queerness and EDA) fundamentally question the reliability and origin of our moral faculties.[19] Consequently, contemporary realists are concentrating their efforts on defending the **reliability of rational faculties** (the Third Factor strategy) and drawing parallels to other normative fields (Partners in Crime).[17] The ongoing philosophical project remains focused on whether the irreducible normativity required by objective moral duty can be systematically reconciled with a thoroughly naturalistic account of human existence.

Works cited

1. What Is Objective Morality? - Verywell Mind, accessed September 30, 2025, https://www.verywellmind.com/what-is-objective-morality-5525515
2. What Is Objective Morality And What Can It Teach Us? - BetterHelp, accessed September 30, 2025, https://www.betterhelp.com/advice/morality/what-is-objective-morality-what-can-it-teach-us/
3. Empirical research on folk moral objectivism - PMC, accessed September 30, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC6686698/
4. What does "objective morality" actually mean? : r/askphilosophy - Reddit, accessed September 30, 2025,

https://www.reddit.com/r/askphilosophy/comments/9d22f6/what_does_objective_morality_actually_mean/
5. Phil. 173: Metaethics Jan. 24, 2018 Lecture 2: Mackie's Argument from Queerness for Nihilism I. Introduction to Moral Nihilism, accessed September 30, 2025, https://scholar.harvard.edu/files/sberker/files/phil173-2018-lec2-mackie.pdf
6. Defining Objective Morality, Subjectivism, Relativism, and More | What the Gospel Demands, accessed September 30, 2025, https://gospeldemands.com/2021/04/12/defining-objective-morality-subjectivism-relativism-and-more/
7. Moral Relativism | Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy, accessed September 30, 2025, https://iep.utm.edu/moral-re/
8. The Challenge of Cultural Relativism, accessed September 30, 2025, https://faculty.uca.edu/rnovy/Rachels--Cultural%20Relativism.htm
9. Moral relativism - Wikipedia, accessed September 30, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Moral_relativism
10. Objectivity | Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy, accessed September 30, 2025, https://iep.utm.edu/objectiv/
11. Moral Relativism, Objectivism, Absolutism, Universalism, Subjectivism, Nihilism, accessed September 30, 2025, https://lucidphilosophy.com/854-2/
12. What's the difference between Moral Nihilism and Moral antirealism : r/askphilosophy, accessed September 30, 2025, https://www.reddit.com/r/askphilosophy/comments/v53c2x/whats_the_difference_between_moral_nihilism_and/
13. Error Theory - J.L. Mackie Argues that All Moral Judgments are False : r/philosophy - Reddit, accessed September 30, 2025, https://www.reddit.com/r/philosophy/comments/bbakm4/error_theory_jl_mackie_argues_that_all_moral/
14. Moral Naturalism - Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, accessed September 30, 2025, https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/naturalism-moral/
15. THE UNIVERSALITY OF OBJECTIVE MORALITY IN HUMAN CULTURE Ignatius Nnaemeka Onwuatuegwu* Abstract This philosophical paper explor - ACJOL.Org, accessed September 30, 2025, https://acjol.org/index.php/NJP/article/download/3669/3592
16. (PDF) THE UNIVERSALITY OF OBJECTIVE MORALITY IN HUMAN CULTURE, accessed September 30, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/378041838_THE_UNIVERSALITY_OF_OBJECTIVE_MORALITY_IN_HUMAN_CULTURE
17. What are the objections to the Argument from Queerness? : r/askphilosophy - Reddit, accessed September 30, 2025, https://www.reddit.com/r/askphilosophy/comments/dg18m2/what_are_the_objections_to_the_argument_from/
18. Moral nihilism - Wikipedia, accessed September 30, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Moral_nihilism
19. Metaethics - Philosophy A Level, accessed September 30, 2025, https://philosophyalevel.com/aqa-philosophy-revision-notes/metaethics/

20. Euthyphro dilemma - Wikipedia, accessed September 30, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Euthyphro_dilemma
21. Full article: Moral progress, knowledge and error: Do people believe in moral objectivity?, accessed September 30, 2025, https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/09515089.2022.2119951
22. Ethical intuitionism - Wikipedia, accessed September 30, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ethical_intuitionism
23. Moral Epistemology - Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, accessed September 30, 2025, https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/moral-epistemology/
24. Moral Epistemology - Philosophy - Oxford Bibliographies, accessed September 30, 2025, https://www.oxfordbibliographies.com/abstract/document/obo-9780195396577/obo-9780195396577-0208.xml
25. Moral Epistemology | Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy, accessed September 30, 2025, https://iep.utm.edu/mor-epis/
26. Kant's moral philosophy, accessed September 30, 2025, https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/kant-moral/
27. Kant's Account of Reason - Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, accessed September 30, 2025, https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/kant-reason/
28. Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals - Wikipedia, accessed September 30, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Groundwork_of_the_Metaphysics_of_Morals
29. Immanuel Kant - Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy, accessed September 30, 2025, https://iep.utm.edu/kantview/
30. Natural Law | Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy, accessed September 30, 2025, https://iep.utm.edu/natlaw/
31. Natural Law ethics - A Level Philosophy & Religious Studies, accessed September 30, 2025, https://alevelphilosophyandreligion.com/natural-law/
32. Value Comparability in Natural Law Ethics: A Defense - PMC - PubMed Central, accessed September 30, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC9662135/
33. Moral Naturalism and Nonnaturalism - Philosophy - Oxford Bibliographies, accessed September 30, 2025, https://www.oxfordbibliographies.com/abstract/document/obo-9780195396577/obo-9780195396577-0215.xml
34. Queerness Arguments Against Moral Realism : r/philosophy - Reddit, accessed September 30, 2025, https://www.reddit.com/r/philosophy/comments/3cko9g/queerness_arguments_against_moral_realism/
35. What is objective morality? - ethics - Philosophy Stack Exchange, accessed September 30, 2025, https://philosophy.stackexchange.com/questions/30683/what-is-objective-morality
36. Divine Command Theory | Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy, accessed September 30, 2025, https://iep.utm.edu/divine-command-theory/
37. Objective Morality vs. Divine Command: You Can't Have Both : r/DebateReligion -

Reddit, accessed September 30, 2025, https://www.reddit.com/r/DebateReligion/comments/1jz1m8j/objective_morality_vs_divine_command_you_cant/
38. Defusing the Euthyphro Dilemma - Convincing Proof, accessed September 30, 2025, https://convincingproof.org/defusing-euthyphro-dilemma/
39. Moral Disagreement - Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, accessed September 30, 2025, https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/disagreement-moral/
40. Mackie's Arguments for the Moral Error Theory - Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, accessed September 30, 2025, https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2020/entries/moral-anti-realism/moral-error-theory.html
41. Moral Error Theory: Are there Moral Facts? - 1000-Word Philosophy: An Introductory Anthology, accessed September 30, 2025, https://1000wordphilosophy.com/2014/04/14/moral-error-theory/
42. What's the argument against moral relativism? : r/askphilosophy - Reddit, accessed September 30, 2025, https://www.reddit.com/r/askphilosophy/comments/2s9ouf/whats_the_argument_against_moral_relativism/
43. The Incoherence of Moral Relativism - CUNY Academic Works, accessed September 30, 2025, https://academicworks.cuny.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1600&context=ny_pubs
44. Mackie's Argument from Queerness - Philosophy A Level, accessed September 30, 2025, https://philosophyalevel.com/posts/mackies-argument-from-queerness/
45. What's the argument from queerness and what are the objections against it? : r/askphilosophy - Reddit, accessed September 30, 2025, https://www.reddit.com/r/askphilosophy/comments/3bqcsf/whats_the_argument_from_queerness_and_what_are/
46. Street's Evolutionary Debunking Argument: Nuancing A Moral Realist Response, accessed September 30, 2025, https://my.wlu.edu/Documents/mudd-center/journal-vol-1/streets-evolutionary-debunking-argument-nuancing-a-moral-realist-response.pdf
47. Evolutionary Debunking, Moral Realism and Moral Knowledge, accessed September 30, 2025, https://www.jesp.org/index.php/jesp/article/view/68
48. A New Evolutionary Debunking Argument Against Moral Realism | Journal of the American Philosophical Association - Cambridge University Press, accessed September 30, 2025, https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/journal-of-the-american-philosophical-association/article/new-evolutionary-debunking-argument-against-moral-realism/F1FC50037D3D6D06CB64BEFA58E7FBCB
49. How do moral realists respond to the evolutionary debunking argument? - Reddit, accessed September 30, 2025, https://www.reddit.com/r/askphilosophy/comments/1kf8t6l/how_do_moral_realists_respond_to_the_evolutionary/

50. Euthyphro's Dilemma - Stand to Reason, accessed September 30, 2025, https://www.str.org/w/euthyphro-s-dilemma-1